DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 485 CS 508 696

AUTHOR Bowen, Michelle; Laurion, Suzanne
TITLE Incidence Rates of Sexual Harassment in Mass Communications Internship Programs: An Initial Study Comparing Intern, Student, and Professional Rates.
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (77th, Atlanta, GA, August 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Communication Research; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Interpersonal Communication; *Mass Media; Sex Differences; *Sexual Harassment; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Concerns

ABSTRACT

A study documented, using a telephone survey, the incidence rates of sexual harassment of mass communication interns, and compared those rates to student and professional rates. A probability sample of 44 male and 52 female mass communications professionals was generated using several random sampling techniques from among professionals who work in Tampa, Florida and who completed a mass communication internship program while an undergraduate or graduate student. Results indicated that (1) the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing at least one form of sexual harassment in their roles as students, interns, and professionals were 32%, 49%, and 65% respectively; (2) the majority of self-reported incidents of sexual harassment were most often minor; (3) the hypothesis that more individuals would be harassed as interns than as students or professionals received some support; (4) women experienced more incidents of sexual harassment than men in all three roles, but the difference was only statistically significant for professionals; (5) males were more often the perpetrators of sexual harassment than females; and (6) some support was found for the hypothesis that victims of sexual harassment viewed the overall quality of their student, intern, and professional experience more negatively than those who were not sexually harassed. Findings suggest that sexual harassment is not an infrequent occurrence in internship programs. (Contains 42 references and 16 tables of data.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 485

Incidence Rates of Sexual Harassment in Mass Communications Internship Programs: An Initial Study Comparing Intern, Student, and Professional Rates

by

Michelle Bowen and Suzanne Laurion

Paper Presented to the Commission on the Status of Women for the 1994 convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications in Atlanta, Georgia.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Bowen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AS508696

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to document, using a telephone survey, the incidence rates of sexual harassment of mass communications interns, and to compare those rates to student and professional rates. This study used a probability sample of male and female mass communications professionals who work in Tampa, Florida. No past research has examined this aspect of student encounters with sexual harassment.

Results indicate, among other things, that sexual harassment is not an infrequent occurrence in internship programs. In fact, almost half of all respondents, all of whom had been in all three roles of student, intern and professional, experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment while an intern.

Incidence Rates of Sexual Harassment in Mass Communications Internship Programs: An Initial Study Comparing Intern, Student, and Professional Rates

The impetus to conduct this study dates back to 1992, and a conversation between an undergraduate student completing a radio internship and her faculty advisor. The conversation was not a scheduled meeting, nor was it a meeting to discuss the educational benefits of the internship. The conversation was about sexual harassment. The student's reports were riveting and disturbing. She reported several incidents of sexual propositions, sexual bodily remarks, and about a time when a male employee placed a golf club up her skirt. Since the institution had no formal procedures specifically targeting interns and sexual harassment, the faculty advisor was at an impasse on how to deal with the reports. A question quickly came to mind: What can universities do to eliminate sexually harassing behaviors that occur outside the university campus, but are still part of the academic life of their students?

For years we've known that sexual harassment is a problem in work (Safran, 1976) and university (Benson & Thomson, 1982) settings. But nowhere in the literature had the special case of the student intern been addressed. The purpose of this study was to collect some preliminary data on how vulnerable student interns are to sexual harassment. With this preliminary data, administrators will be in a better position to take appropriate action(s), if needed, to mollify the occurrence of sexual harassment of its internship students.

Theoretical Framework

At the theoretical level, sexual harassment is believed to be motivated by dominance, not sexual desire (Benson and Thomson, 1982). According to the dominance theory, males attempt to dominate women in order to maintain their ascribed gender-role. Although dominance theory is widely cited, it leaves many questions unanswered. Two major shortcomings of the dominance theory are: (1) It fails to acknowledge males who have been sexually harassed, and (2) It fails to recognize achieved power as a significant variable when discussing the motivation behind incidents of sexual harassment.

Conflict theory, a sociological based theory, helps resolve the forementioned shortcomings. Conflict theory explains sexual harassment by emphasizing both achieved (e.g., professional status) and ascribed power (e.g., gender) differences (McKinney, 1990). McKinney (1990) explains conflict theory as follows:

> ". . . competition for limited resources . . . [i.e, jobs). . . and the desire to have the interests of one's own group dominate . . .[i.e., males over females or females over males] . . . influence definitions of, frequency of, and responses to sexual harassment. . . [and] sexual harassment as intimidation is one way for higher status/power [ascribed and achieved] individuals to maintain that power and control over lower status individuals (p.423).

Utilizing tnis theoretical perspective, it would be expected that individuals, especially females, are more vulnerable to sexual harassment while in their internship settings than while in their professional settings. This conclusion is based on the fact that: (1) interns are always in a lower status position than

permanently employed workers in the setting; (2) interns are always in a supervised role; (3) interns are normally young, hence their achieved power as adults is limited; and (4) interns, if female, are in an even lower status position due to female's ascribed position in society.

It would also be expected that individuals would experience more sexual harassment while an intern than while a student. This is due to the fact that threats to achieved power are limited in an academic setting where it is unlikely that a student would be a candidate for a faculty member's job. In a work setting, however, an intern could eventually be promoted to a position currently held by a full-time worker.

Literature Review

Incident Rates

Since internship programs require students to complete their credit hours off the university campus and within the work place, the prevalence of sexual harassment within the work place is important to establish. Many studies have verified the high frequency of sexual harassment in the work place. Early studies suggest that well over half of all working women have experienced some form of sexual harassment in their careers (Farley, 1978; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Safran, 1976; Read, 1982). More recent studies show that mass communications work settings are not excluded for these high incident rates. For instance, there have been several studies conducted on sexual harassment in the newspaper industry. McAdams and Beasley (1992) surveyed 273 women in the Washington Press Corps (a media women's organization) on the incidence of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sexual harassment in the newsroom. Of the 102 responses, 80% stated that sexual harassment was a problem for news women, and 60% stated they had personally experienced sexual harassment.

In the April-May special year report edition of APME News, it was stated that a survey of nineteen newspapers (including large, medium-sized, and small newspapers) showed that 37.6% of the 640 male and female respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment (Kossan, 1992). Respondents reported such behaviors as: annoying/degrading comments about sex (65%), offensive pictures or posters (37%), annoying/degrading comments about body (37%), physical contact respondent didn't want (31%), and sexual demands (no job-related threats) (21%) (Kossan, 1992).

A comment from a female respondent in the APME survey conveys what might be the feelings and problems encountered by female interns when they enter the work environment:

> I have suffered harassment, all from male supervisors. I consider newsrooms to be often hostile environments for women. Most of it comes in the form of 'joking' and I never complained. I'm 37 now, and I would seek action if it happened now. As a young reporter, it was part of the 'game.' I do think things are getting better, but maybe it is just because I'm not young, unmarried, unsure, and an easy target anymore (Kossan, 1992, p.7).

In a study which integrated both work and university settings, Maihoff and Forrest (1983) surveyed 478 undergraduate and graduate women at Michigan State University to assess the incidence of sexual harassment in their classroom, assistantships, and outside work environments. Of the 478 respondents, 25% had experienced at least one incident of sexual

harassment. However, even though the authors did state that there were "clear differences" among the environments examined, they did not present separate results for each setting. One exception was the statement, "out of the 16 incidents of touching and fondling reported, 14 were perpetrated by male co-workers in the work environment" (p.445).

Age, Status, and Gender

Female mass communications interns may be vulnerable to sexual harassment for factors such as age, status and gender. Such factors have been shown to be significantly important in predicting the incidence of sexual harassment.

Studd and Gattiker (1991) stated that younger women are disproportionately the most common victims of sexual harassment in organizations, including more severe forms of harassment (e.g., violence). The researchers also found that these women were more often harassed by superiors than by co-workers (also see Coles, 1986; Pope, Levenson, and Schover, 1979 p.687). In the university setting, McKinney (1990) surveyed faculty members to examine the prevalence and nature of sexual harassment by their peers and students. McKinney's findings indicated that respondents were more likely to be harassed by colleagues of a higher academic rank, and those that were harassed were more often women (McCormick, Adams-Bohley, Peterson, & Gaeddert, 1989).

Other studies have not generated the same results, at least not regarding the status factor (Littler-Bishop et al., 1982, p.143; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982, p.45; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Loy & Steward, 1984; MSPB, 1981). Kossan's (1992) results

showed that the act of sexual harassment was overwhelmingly initiated by co-workers (67%) as opposed to supervisors (18%); however, women continued to be almost the exclusive victims of sexual harassment in the newsroom setting.

Since intern students from universities are normally young, sometimes women, and always in a supervised role, they may be prime targets for sexual harassment.

Emotional Effects

What happens to these students when they are targets of sexual harassment? Indeed, several studies have documented the fact that sexual harassment is potentially devastating to students (Moore & Hoover, 1987; Livingston, 1982; Schneider, 1987).

Cammaert's (1985) research showed that student victims have experienced such psychological problems as lowered self-esteem, decreased feelings of competence and confidence, and increased feelings of anger, frustration, depression and anxiety. Reilly, Lott, and Gallogly (1986) found similar effects of sexual harassment. They stated that such outcomes as "discontinuation of certain fields of study and retardation of personal growth" were indicated by respondents' comments (p.354). Such outcomes may not only deprive students of certain educational needs, but also of later career opportunities (Crull, 1982).

Based on the literature review and the theoretical perspective discussed above, the following hypotheses were made:

H1: Mass communications students, interns, and professionals experience sexual harassment.
H2: The majority of self-reported incidents of sexual harassment will most often be minor (e.g., sexist comments) in nature.

H3: Mass communications internship students are experiencing sexual harassment more than mass communications students and professionals.
H4: More women than men experience sexual harassment as interns, students and professionals.
H5: Males are most often the perpetrators of sexual harassment.
H6: Respondents who reported having been sexually harassed will view the overall quality of their student, intern, and professional experience more negatively than those who say they have not been sexually harassed.

Methods

Respondents and Procedures

Respondents in this study were a probability sample of 52 female and 44 male (n=96) mass communications professionals who completed a mass communications internship program while an undergraduate or graduate student. A mass communications professional was operationally defined as any individual employed at a company advertised in the 1992-1993 GTE Tampa Yellow Pages as a journalist, advertiser, public relations practitioner, or radio and television broadcaster or producer in Tampa, Florida (and surrounding communities). It also was operationally defined by allowing each respondent to use his/her own definition of whether he/she is employed as a mass communication professional.

The sample was assembled by utilizing several random sampling procedures. The first procedure was to cluster sample all mass communications establishments in the Tampa Bay area that advertised specializing in one or more of the above professional categories. The list produced from this process was then randomized and labeled the "master list."

Once the "master list" had been completed, a proportionate stratified sample of telephone numbers from each category was calculated, and a "survey list" was produced. The last sampling

technique entailed generating random lists of the alphabet for every telephone number in each of the five professional categories on the "survey list." The alphabet lists were used to randomly assign individuals to the sample population of telephone numbers.

Instrument

The measures for this study were contained in a telephone-administered, four page questionnaire instrument. The survey was pre-tested on graduate students in the School of Mass Communications at the University of South Florida.

The questionnaire for this study included a list of 22 behaviors considered to be possible examples of sexual harassment. Respondents were asked to consider whether they had experienced any of the behaviors while in the role of a university student, an intern, and a professional.

The behavior items were adopted from previous studies conducted on the incidence of sexual harassment in work and university settings (Malovich and Stake, 1991; McKinney, 1990; Popovich, Licata, Nokovich, Martelli, & Zoloty (1987); and Powell, 1983, 1986) as well as items from the California Fair Employment and Housing Department's suggested policy for employers (Coles, 1986).

After respondents were assured of the voluntary and anonymous nature of the survey, respondents were told that the purpose of the survey was to assess the incidence and reporting rates of sexual harassment and sexual attention in internship programs and to compare these rates to student and professional rates. They also were told to use their own experiences when

completing the survey, not others' experiences. In past research, this step has been shown to be important because perceptions of others' experiences may be misleading, and specifically in this study, completely irrelevant (Popovich et. al., 1986).

When respondents were asked to consider whether they have experienced any of the 22 behaviors, they were given some cognitive guidance by the researcher. For example, when thinking back to experiences they might have had while in their role as a intern, the researcher stated: "Conjure up some memories of the place, the people you worked with, your supervisor(s), and the work you did." Respondents were also reminded to *only* consider experiences that happened to them while in the work or academic setting.

Sexual harassment was operationalized in this study in two ways. First, it was operationalized by simply using the term "sexual harassment" and allowing respondents to use their own definitions of this term. Second, sexual harassment was operationalized by using a list of specific behaviors frequently considered to be sexual harassment (McKinney, 1990).

The term sexual attention at the beginning of the survey was used to avoid possible response biases attached to the term sexual harassment when it is used alone (Malovich & Stake, 1991). Behaviors not normally perceived to be sexual harassment were not included in the survey. For example, although behaviors such as staring and flirting are the most frequent forms of sexual attention, these behaviors are not usually considered sexual harassment (Powell, 1983).

The list was repeated three separate times for each respondent for the three separate roles being examined (i.e., student, intern, and professional).

If while completing the behavior checklist a respondent indicated that he/she had experienced a behavior, the researcher asked follow-up questions, such as: (1) "Who was the perpetrator of the behavior indicated?" and (2) "Was the perpetrator(s) male or female?"

Finally, there were several demographic and background questions such as sex, marital status while a student, intern and professional, class rank while an intern, and age while a student, intern, and professional.

Results

To analyze the incidence rates in all three roles, the researcher collapsed the twenty-three behaviors into three categories labeled (a) experienced no behaviors, (b) experienced one to four behaviors, and (c) experienced five or more behaviors. Therefore, rates indicate the number of respondents who have experienced none or some degree of sexual harassment.

H1. Hypothesis one suggested that mass communications students, interns, and professionals experience sexual harassment. This hypothesis was supported. The percentage of respondents who reported experiencing at least one form of sexual harassment in their roles as students, interns, and professionals were 32%, 49%, and 65% respectively (see Tables 1, 2, and 3). These results suggest that sexual harassment is experienced in all three roles, but it is experienced at different rates.

H2. It was hypothesized that the majority of self-reported

incidents of sexual harassment would most often be minor (e.g., sexist comments). To test this hypothesis, the twenty-two behaviors in the questionnaire were organized into groups and ranked from more to less severe (see Table 4 for definitions of each group, the behaviors included in each group, and the ranked severity level of each behavior in a group). Hypothesis 2 was supported.

As shown on Table 4, respondents most often experienced the less severe forms of sexual harassment in their student, intern, and professional roles. Note, however, that the behaviors in the "sexual remarks" group--defined by Gruber (1992) as statements which intend to demean personally or generally, but express no overt intention to have a relationship--had greater within-group variability in all three roles than the behaviors in the other three groups. For example, as interns, respondents reported experiencing 53 incidents of the less severe forms of "sexual remarks" (i.e., inappropriate sexual jokes), but they also experienced 46 incidents of the more severe forms of "sexual remarks" (e.g., comments about body). Also noteworthy were the number of incidents of "sexual propositions" reported by respondents. "Sexual propositions" were overwhelmingly the most reported "sexual request" in all three roles of student, intern, and professional. Interns, for example, reported sixteen incidents of sexual propositions. For clarity, "Sexual propositions," as opposed to "required sexual activity" or "treats in exchange for sex," can be defined as a sexual requests made by perpetrators without ultimatums of expulsion or violence.

H3. It was hypothesized that more individuals would be

harassed as interns than as students or professionals. This hypothesis received some support.

To analyze the difference in frequencies of sexual harassment among the three roles, three 2 x 3 (intern rate by professional rate, intern rate by student rate, and professional rate by student rate) chi-square analyses were performed. As shown on Table 5, when professional and intern rates were compared, there was a strong significant difference between the two roles, $X^2(1, N = 96) = 20.07$, $p<.00001$. However, the difference was not in the hypothesized direction; rather, professionals reported experiencing significantly more incidents of sexual harassment than interns. On the other hand, as hypothesized, internship rates were significantly higher than student rates, $X^2(1, N = 96) = 9.76$, $p<.001$ (see Table 6).

Professional and student rates were also crosstabbed; the results showed a significant difference between these two roles, $X^2(1, N = 96) = 14.47$, $P<.0001$ (see Table 7).

H4. Hypothesis 4 suggested that more women than men experience sexual harassment as students, interns, and professionals. There was partial support for this hypothesis.

As shown on Tables 8, 9, 10, women (n = 52) experienced more incidents of sexual harassment than men (n = 44) in all three roles, but the difference was only statistically significant for professionals, $X^2(2, N = 96) = 7.57$, $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

H5. Results showed support for hypothesis 5, that males would more often be the perpetrators of sexual harassment than females (multiple responses allowed). Over 2 1/2 times as many males than females were indicated as the perpetrators of sexual

harassment in all three roles examined (see Tables 11, 12, 13).

H6. Some support was found for hypothesis 6, that victims of sexual harassment will view the overall quality of their student, intern, and professional experience more negatively than those who have not been sexually harassed.

Spearman rank-correlations were performed to analyze the relationships between respondents' perceived quality of their student, internship, and professional roles by the amount of sexually harassing behaviors they experienced in each role. As shown on Table 14, the results of the correlations indicated that there was a significant negative relationship for interns ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$) and professionals ($r = -.33$, $p < .001$); No relationship was found for students.

When the above correlations were controlled by sex, there was a significant negative relationship for females as professionals and interns (professional, $r = -.34$, $p < .01$; intern, $r = -.28$, $p < .05$)(see Table 15). No relationship was found for female students. For males, there was a significant negative relationship as professionals only ($r = -.34$, $p < .05$) (see Table 16). Hence, it appears that whereas the intern experience and professional experience for females are negatively related to perceived harassment, only professional experience for males is negatively related to perceived harassment. It also appears that the student experience for both men and women is not related to perceptions of having been harassed.

Descriptive Information

The sample for this study consisted mainly of young and unmarried mass communications professionals, who also were young

and unmarried as university and internship students. Most respondents indicated that the overall quality of their student, intern, and professional experiences were on the positive side of the scale (82%, 84%, and 86% respectively). Of the those respondents who experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment as students and professionals, peers were mentioned most often as the perpetrators (81% students and 67% professionals) (multiple responses were allowed). For interns, staff members were most often indicated as the perpetrators (38%).

Discussion

Incidence Rates

As predicted, mass communications students, interns, and professionals experienced sexual harassment, but, they experience it at different rates. Past studies show that professionals experienced high rates of sexual harassment (Baldridge and McLean, 1980), while students experienced moderate rates (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Rubin and Borgers, 1990). However, in the present study, the percentage found for professionals was higher than studies examining sexual harassment in the mass communications field of journalism. For example, surveys conducted by McAdams and Beasley (1992), Kossan (1992), and NewsInc. (1991) found that 60%, 38%, and 44% respectively of women journalists said that they had experienced sexual harassment. The higher percentage found for professionals in the present study (65%) may have been caused by the fact that several mass communications fields, not just journalism, were examined in this study. By way of illustration, sexual harassment may be

more of a problem in the television industry than in the newspaper industry, and therefore its inclusion in the study may have increased the percentage obtained. One respondent stated:

> I think television has its own qualities that lend itself to sexual harassment. Television stations depend on beautiful women. There is an enormous importance placed on a woman's beauty. . .so naturally there will be a fallout form that projection of women.

Another respondent stated that radio stations are "the worst place for women to work." Radio stations have "earned every bit of their bad reputation...they [management and co-workers] are socially rude." In agreement, another respondent stated "radio is a very 'old-boy' network. . .I would never recommend that a woman get into the radio business."

Due to the small sample size used in this study, rates among the different mass communications professions were not statistically tested; therefore, this rationale should be tested in later studies.

The moderate rate (32%) of the incidence of sexual harassment of students found in this study replicates several studies conducted on university campuses (e.g., see Benson & Thomson, 1982; Cammaert, 1985; Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Wilson & Kraus, 1983). However, other past studies conducted on university campuses do not support the moderate rate of sexual harassment for students. For example, Lott, Reilly, and Howard (1982) surveyed 927 male and female university students and found that only .8% of males and 7.1% of females reported personally experiencing sexual harassment (also see Metha & Nigg, 1983; McCormack, 1985). Schneider (1987), on the

other hand, found a high percentage (60%) of female students had experienced sexual harassment. Nonetheless, Rubin and Borgers (1990), after a painstaking meta-analysis of studies examining the incidence of sexual harassment on university campuses, concluded that 30% was a reliable estimate of the incidence of sexual harassment of university students. In keeping with Rubin and Borgers conclusion, the present study found that 32.2% of respondents said they'd been harassed as students.

Interestingly, interns experienced a moderately high rate (49%) of sexual harassment. In fact, the rate of interns who have experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment was almost exactly midway between student and professional rates (17% and 16% respectively). It appears, therefore, that as work experience increases, the more likely it is that an individual will experience sexual harassment. These results appear in keeping with LaFontaine and Tredeau's (1986) finding that the length of employment influences the amount of sexual harassment experienced by women. Their results showed that employees with two to three years of work experience endured more sexual harassment than individuals with only one year of work experience (also see Booth-Butterfield, 1989).

Gender and Incidence

One very consistent finding from previous studies has been that women experience more sexual harassment than men as students (Kenig & Ryan, 1986; McCormick et al., 1989; McKinney, 1990) and as workers (Coles, 1986; Studd & Gattiker, 1991). Yet, this study was marked by an absence of significant gender differences for students and interns; there was, however, a significant

difference for professionals.

Even though there was a significant difference between males and females as professionals, the rates of harassment for male respondents was much higher than rates found in past studies. Specifically, 27%, 46% and 50% of male respondents experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment as students, interns, and professionals respectively. These rates for men are drastically different from the consistently low rates found in past studies (e.g., see Lott et al., 1982). There are at least two possible explanations for this finding. First, the issue of sexual harassment has gained considerable media coverage in the recent past, and this coverage has increased awareness in both males and females (Duhe, 1992). Second, in the present study, unlike other studies, men were surveyed on all three roles while in their role as a professional. Hence, this methodology may have significantly increased male rates because as men "gain work experience the gap between what women label as harassing and what men label as harassing behavior narrows" (Booth-Butterfield, 1989, p. 271). One male respondent stated, "I felt weird when she [an employee at his internship] looked at my butt, but others would think it was strange to report the behavior. . .now [as a professional] I would report. . . . Another male respondent stated that he had sexual intercourse with his married internship supervisor, but, it was not done against his will, so "it was not sexual harassment." However, as a professional he stated, "I see men and women interact sexually on a daily basis. . .and date . . .that can cause problems, especially sexual harassment."

Severity Level

As hypothesized, mass communications students, interns, and professionals most often experienced the less severe forms of harassment. Specifically, the less severe forms of "sexual remarks" were experienced most often in all three roles (see Table 4). These results correspond to studies that sampled students and full-time workers on the incidence of sexual harassment. Baldridge and Mclean's (1980) and Powell's (1983) results showed that "sexual remarks" were the most frequent forms of sexual harassment of full-time workers. Correspondingly, studies conducted in mass communications work settings found that "annoying and degrading sexual comments" (Kossan, 1992) and "verbal remarks" (Duhe, 1992) were the most frequent forms of sexual harassment encountered by full-time workers.

Studies conducted on university campuses also have found "sexual remarks" to be the most prevalent form of sexual harassment. For instance, Wilson and Kraus (1983) stated "verbal harassment" was the most frequent form of sexual harassment experienced by students. Additionally, Maihoff & Forrest (1983) examined university students' experiences of sexual harassment in their work environments (on and off the college campus, but not including internship programs) and found that "sexual jokes" was the most frequent form of sexual harassment.

A female respondent commented about the subtlety of some forms of sexual harassing verbal remarks. She stated, "I had a boss at a small paper, he would introduce me as my 'Little XX'. . . .You'd never hear a male being introduced as 'little'

anything." A male public relations practitioner/respondent declared a high level of uncomfortableness when a female co-worker remarked, 'you look today, do you want to fuck?' Several other respondents, however, did not acknowledge sexual remarks as sexual harassment. For instance, respondents made such statements as: "When men and women work together sex will come up sometimes;" and "There were always sexual jokes, but I never called it sexual harassment by any means. People talk about sex, but in a playful way."

Perpetrator

As predicted by past studies conducted in university and work settings, males were the primary perpetrators of sexual harassment of mass communications students, interns and professionals (see Farley, 1978; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; MSPB, 1981; Schneider, 1987; Ollenburger & Moore, 1992). For professionals and students, male peers were named most often as the perpetrators of sexual harassment[1]. In support of this study's findings, LaFontaine and Tredeau (1986) found that male peers were the most frequent source of sexual harassment in the work place, and Kossan (1992) found similar results for professionals in the newspaper industry. In contrast, Coles (1986) and Studd and Gattiker (1991) stated that professionals were more often harassed by male superiors than male co-workers. Similarly, McCormick et al. (1989) found that students were harassed more often by individuals in a position of authority.

---

[1] For interns, the perpetrators were most often staff members. The researcher felt no reason to speculate or discuss the achieved status of perpetrators for interns because interns are always in a lower-level status position than all permanent employees at their internship setting.

Quality of Role

There was only partial support for the hypothesis that as sexual harassment increases, the perceived quality of one's role decreases. The results suggest that the perceived quality of an experience is related to sexual harassment for interns and professionals, not students. This result for students does not support Moore and Hoover's (1987) hypothesis that sexual harassment negatively affects a student's university life (also see Lott et al., 1982; Reilly et al., 1986; Till, 1980). One explanation for this discrepancy is that students perceive less behaviors as sexually harassing than workers, and therefore, do not recognize it as a problem; in fact, most students consider sexual behavior normative for college environments (Baker et al., 1990). This is especially true when the behaviors are perpetrated by peers as opposed to someone with authority, as was the case in the present study (Popovich et al., 1987). Popovich et. al (1987) explains:

> College is viewed by some men and women as an opportunity for increased socialization and interaction with the opposite sex, and therefore, the attitudes and norms regarding social-sexual behavior held by college students may be somewhat different then those held by working women. (p.397)

Several comments made by respondents in their student role uphold this argument. For example, one female respondent stated that the sexual looks and gestures she received were "the usual looks you get from guys in college. Nothing meant to be derogatory or to harass." "With my friends at school," another female respondent stated, "I was more flattered by the attention.

If it were by a professor, I probably would not be flattered." One male respondent further stated, "I went to an all-male military school. I wished for some sexual harassment."

When controlled by sex, the quality of professional roles for men and women still decreased as sexual harassment increased. However, as interns, only females maintained a significant decrease in role quality as sexual harassment increased. Booth-Butterfield (1989) made a statement that may explain these findings:

> Male college students [in this case student interns] may believe they can handle any situation and have difficulty envisioning themselves in sexually threatening interactions. . .as men enter and participate in their careers, however, they may find that such threats are not out of the realm of possibility. (p. 271)

Furthermore, since sexual harassment has always been considered a female problem, women may become cognizant of these behaviors at an earlier age than men (Booth-Butterfield, 1989).

Theoretical Support

Conflict theory was presented in this paper as a theoretical foundation for the incidence of sexual harassment in internship programs. This theory maintains its explanatory puissance even though several hypotheses were only partially supported. The results of this study suggest that the concept of power is complex, and that other factors working simultaneously in the work environment affect when ascribed and achieved power differentials will motivate an act of sexual harassment.

Contrary to the stated hypothesis, respondents experienced more sexual harassment as professionals than as interns. This

result, however, can be explained by conflict theory's recognition of power differentials in the work place and the length of employment between interns and professionals. As stated above, the length of employment has been shown to be related to the amount of sexual harassment experienced by an individual in the work place. It is reasonable to suggest that as length of employment increases, so does the one's achieved status via promotional advancements or tenure. Keeping this in mind, the fully employed status of female professionals, as opposed to the interim status of interns, would motivate more acts of sexual harassment because of the increased threats they pose to male professionals' achieved and ascribed power. In other words, threats to achieved power (or hopes of achieved power) and "the desire to have the interests of one's own [gender] group dominate. . .influences. . .[the incidence] of sexual harassment (McKinney, 1990, p.423).

The results of this study also suggest that achieved power is more of a motivating factor for the incidence of sexual harassment than ascribed power. Support for this assumption is that there were no gender differences in the amount of sexual harassment experienced by interns, but there were gender differences for professionals. Therefore, although male interns may have traditionally enjoyed more ascribed power than female interns, their lack of achieved status in the work force seemingly left them just as vulnerable to acts of sexual harassment as female interns.

To further support this assumption that achieved power outweighs ascribed power, consider the results that male co-

workers, (considered "staff members" by interns) not male supervisors, were the primary perpetrators of sexual harassment. Being that ascribed power is constant for male staff members and male supervisors, these results can only be explained by the achieved power differentials between these two groups. Since women professionals have entered mass communications fields in increasing numbers, competition for jobs has also increased. Keeping this in mind, lower achieved status males may fear this increased competition in the work place more than males who have already gained achieved power, and therefore, react by victimizing women co-workers with sexual harassment.

Limitations of This Study

The results of chi-square analyses and Spearman rank-correlations should be applied with caution due to their low measures of associations (all were below .35).

Generalizability of this study's results may also be limited for methodology reasons. First, this study generated a proportionate stratified sample of agencies and businesses, but no attempt was made to further stratify by the number of individuals actually working at each telephone number called. This should not be seen as a problem, however, because only a small number of respondents (usually one per call) were needed from every agency called.

Second, this study only used local telephone numbers to gather respondents. Thirdly, many respondents were not reached via the specified methodology. This may not be a limitation, however, because the businesses not sampled in the specified format were small firms that only employed one individual who

completed an internship. In other words, the utilization of the random alphabet lists would not have generated any more respondents, so no bias is expected. Furthermore, the fact that the results obtained in this study replicate several past studies further supports the generalizability of this study, while also giving credibility to the methodology employed.

A potential bias of this study may be that women tend to have higher response rates than men (McKinney, 1990). Although there were slightly more females than males, no biases are suspected because no businesses or individuals refused to participate in the study due to topic being investigated. The main reasons for not participating were innocuous in nature. For instance, the primary reason given for not participating in the study was that the individual was "on deadline."

Several suggestions for future research arise from conducting this study. This study should be replicated using a national sample to assess generalizability. Other methodological improvements might entail randomly selecting respondents by the number of employees at each business sampled and conducting more extensive interviews to obtain more in-depth information.

The results of this study also suggest that the exclusion of men when researching sexual harassment is a serious omission and shortcoming of many past studies and should not be ignore when addressing the issue of sexual harassment.

This study offers some interesting new information about sexual harassment of mass communications internship students, and the comparisons between the roles are particularly useful in understanding how the amount of work experience relates to the

occurrence of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment of internship students is not an infrequent occurrence. In fact, almost half of all respondents surveyed experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment as an intern. This information should prove vital to universities attempting to eradicate this behavior. Universities may consider implementing separate formal or informal preventive and curative policies that will remedy the negative implications of sexual harassment of internship students. They may also want to consider implementing sexual harassment education and awareness programs that include a mutual and ongoing relationship with internship settings. As one male respondent stated, "There is a fine line a lot of the time. . .between sexual harassment and flirting. . .and some cross over often." The hope is that this research will encourage appropriate action on the part of university and internship administrators/supervisors, so students can assess more accurately that "fine line" and reap all the benefits internships have to offer.

REFERENCES

Baldridge, K., McLean, G. (1980). Sexual harassment: How much of a problem is it...really? Journal of Business Education, 55(7), 294-297.

Benson, D. J. and Thompson, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confidence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. Social Problems, 29, 236-251.

Booth-Butterfield, M. (1989). Perception of harassing communication as a function of locus of control, work force participation, and gender. Communication Quarterly, 37(4), 262-275.

Cammaert, L. P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? International Journal Of Women's Studies, 8, 388-397.

Coles, F. S. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. Sex Roles, 14, 81-95.

Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counseling. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52, 539-544.

Duhe, S. F. (1992). Sexual harassment in television newsrooms. Paper presented to the Radio-Television Journalism Division of Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in Montreal, Canada.

Dziech, B. W. and Weiner, L. (1984). The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus. Boston: Beacon Press.

Farley, L. (1978). Sexual shakedown: Sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fitzgerald, L. F. Weitzman, L. M., Gold, Y., and Ormerod, M. (1988). Academic harassment: Sex and denial in scholarly garb. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 329-340.

Gruber, J. E. (1992). A topology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990s. Sex Roles, 26, 447-463.

It does happen here. (1991 December). News Inc., pp.27, 30-31.

Kossan, P. (1992 April/May). Sexual harassment in the newsroom and on the job [special report]. Associated Press Managing Editors News, 195, 1, 2-10.

Kenig, S. and Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. Sex Roles, 15, 535-549.

LaFontaine, E., and Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 15, 433-441.

Littler-Bishop, S., Seidler-Feller, D., Opaluch, R. E. (1982). Sexual harassment in the workplace as a function of initiator's status: The case of airline personnel. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 137-148.

Livingston, J. (1982). A theory of the sexual harassment dynamic in the workplace: Resources, actions, and outcomes. Dissertations Abstract International, 45(3), 1661-1662B.

Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., and Howard, P. R.(1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture And Society, 8, 296-319.

Loy, P. and Stewart, L. (1984). The extent and effects of the sexual harassment of working women. Sociological Focus, 17, 31-43.

Maihoff, N. and Forrest, L. (1983). Sexual harassment in higher education; An assessment study. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 46, 3-8.

Malovich, N. J., and Stake, J. E. (1991). Sexual harassment on campus: Individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 14, 63-81.

McAdams, K. C. and Beasley, M. H. (1992). Sexual harassment of Washington women journalists: An initial study. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of education in Journalism and Mass Communications, Montreal.

McCormack, A. (1985). The sexual harassment of students by teachers: The case of students in science. Sex Roles, 13, 21-32.

McCormick, N., Adams-Bohley, S., Peterson, S. and Gaeddert, W. (1989). Sexual harassment of students at a small college. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans,Administrators and Counselors, 52, 15-23.

McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. Sex Roles, 23 (7-8), 421-438.

Metha, A. and Nigg, T. (1983). Sexual harassment on campus: An institutional response. Journal of the National Association of Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 46, 23-29.

Moore, H. A. and Hoover, L. A. (1987). Contrasting sexual harassment in education: Teachers, students and staff. Paper presented at the National Women's Studies Association.

Nieva, V. F., and Gutek, B. A. (1981). Women and work: A psychological perspective. N.Y.: Praeger.

Pope, K. S., Levenson, H., Schover, R. (1979). Sexual intimacy in psychology training: Results and implications of a national survey. American Psychologist, 34(8), 682-689.

Popovich, P. M., Licata, B. J., Nokovich, D., Martelli, T., Zoloty, S. (1987). Assessing the incidence and perceptions of sexual harassing behaviors among American undergraduates. Journal of Psychology, 120, 387-396

Read, S. (1982). Sexual harassment at work. Feltham Middlesex, England: Hamlyn Paperbacks.

Reilly, M. E., Lott, B. and Gallogly, S. M. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. Sex Roles, 15, 333-358.

Rubin, L. J. and Borgers, S. B. (1990). Sexual harassment in universities during the 1980's. Sex Roles, 23, 397-411.

Safran, C. (1976) What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. Redbook, 149, 217-223.

Schneider, B. E. (1987). Graduate women, sexual harassment, and university policy. Journal of Higher Education, 58, 46-65.

Studd, M. V. and Gattiker, U. E. (1991). The evolutionary psychology of sexual harassment in organizations. Ethology and Sociobiology, 12(4), 249-290.

Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R. and Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 33-54.

Till, F. J. (1980). Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students. Report of the National Advisory Counsel of Women's Educational Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). Sexual Harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem? Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wilson, K.R. and Kraus, L.A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 219-224.

Women were anxious to talk. (1991 December). NewsInc., pp.28-29.

APPENDIX
TABLES

Table 1. The Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Student Collapsed into Categories

Amount of Behaviors	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Five or More	9	9.4	9.4
One to Four	22	22.9	32.3
None	65	67.7	100.0
Total	96	100.0	100.0

Table 2. The Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as an Intern Collapsed into Categories

Amount of Behaviors	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Five or More	17	17.7	17.7
One to Four	30	31.3	49.0
None	49	51.0	100.0
Total	96	100.0	100.0

Table 3. The Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Professional Collapsed into Categories

Amount of Behaviors	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Five or More	26	27.1	27.1
One to Four	36	37.5	64.6
None	34	35.4	100.0
Total	96	100.0	100.0

Table 4. The Frequency of Sexually Harassing Behaviors Experienced in Each of the Four Behavior Categories Ordered from More to Less Severe.

Behavior Categories	Role		
Sexual Remarks	Internship	Student	Professional
Body Comments	20	9	25
Insulting Remarks	4	2	10
Complimentary Remarks	22	12	25
Inappropriate Remarks	15	9	23
Inappropriate Jokes	17	12	30
Sexist Comments	21	18	42
Total	99	62	155
Sexual Requests			
Required Sexual Activity	0	0	2
Threats in Exchange For Sex	0	0	5
Promises in Exchange	5	1	6
Required Socializing/Dating	2	0	2
Sexual Propositions	16	6	15
Continued Sexual Interest	7	2	13
Total	30	9	43
Nonverbal Displays			
Rape	0	1	0
Assault/Attempted Rape	0	0	1
Sexual Touching/Grabbing	4	2	15
Nonsexual Touching/Grabbing	7	3	5
Impeded/Blocked Movement	3	1	10
Insulting Sexual Looks/Gestures	2	0	7
Complimentary Looks/Gestures	18	14	17
Total	34	21	55
Either			
Sexual Displays	8	3	13
Sexual Notes or Letters	3	5	10
Obscene Telephone Calls	0	0	2
Other	2	0	1
Total	13	8	26

Note. Definitions of the groups are as follows: (a) Sexual Requests-statements which are goal and relationship oriented; (b) Sexual Remarks-statements which intend to demean personally or generally, but express no overt intentions to have a relationship; (c) Nonverbal Displays-behaviors used to demean or intimidate on the basis of one's sex; and Either-requests or remarks which depend on the content of the communication (Gruber, 1992). Behaviors in each group, except either category, are ordered from more to less severe.

Table 5. The Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Professional By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as an Intern

	Professional Harassment			
Intern Harassment	5+	One to Four	None	Row Total
5+	9	8	0	17
One to Four	9	15	6	30
None	8	13	28	49
Column Total	26	36	34	96

Note. $X^2(1, N = 96) = 20.07, p<.00001$.

Table 6. The Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as an Intern By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Student

	Intern Harassment			
Student Harassment	5+	One to Four	None	Row Total
5+	5	5	7	17
One to Four	3	6	21	30
None	1	11	37	49
Column Total	9	22	65	96

Note. $X^2(1, N = 96) = 9.76, p<.001$.

Table 7. The Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Student By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as a Professional

	Student Harassment			
Professional Harassment	5+	One to Four	Low None	Total
5+	8	5	13	26
One to Four	1	12	23	36
None	0	5	29	34
Column Total	9	22	65	96

Note. $X^2(1, N = 96) = 14.47, P<.0001$.

Table 8. Percentage and Frequency of the Sex of Respondents By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced in Their Intern Role

Amount of Behaviors	Men		Women	
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
5+	14	6	21	11
1-4	32	14	31	16
None	54	24	48	25

Note. Men(n=44); Women (n=52).

Table 9. Percentage and Frequency of the Sex of Respondents By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced in Their Student Role

Amount of Behaviors	Men		Women	
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
5+	11	5	8	4
1-4	16	7	29	15
None	73	32	63	33

Note. Men(n=44); Women (n=52).

Table 10. Percentage and Frequency of the Sex of Respondents By the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced in Their Professional Role

Amount of Behaviors	Men		Women	
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
5+	20	9	33	17
1-4	30	13	44	23
None	50	22	23	12

Note. $X^2(2, N = 96) = 7.57$, $p < .05$. Men(n=44); Women (n=52).

Table 11. The Frequency and Percentage of the Sex of a Perpetrator(s) as Indicated By Respondents in Their Professional Role

Perpetrator's Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	32	53.3
Female	12	20.0
Both	14	23.4
Both/Don't Know	1	1.7
Male/Don't Know	1	1.7

Note. Two missing values. Multiple responses were allowed for each sexually harassing behavior experienced, but the researcher collapsed the "sex of the perpetrator(s)" into one of the above categories for each respondent.

Table 12. The Frequency and Percentage of the Sex of a Perpetrator(s) as Indicated by Respondents in Their Intern Role

Perpetrator's Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	27	57.4
Female	10	21.3
Both	8	17.0
Don't Know	1	2.1
Both/Don't Know	1	2.1

Note. Multiple responses were allowed for each sexually harassing behavior experienced, but the researcher collapsed the "sex of the perpetrator(s)" into one of the above categories for each respondent.

Table 13. The Frequency and Percentage of the Sex of a Perpetrator(s) as Indicated by Respondents in Their Student Role

Perpetrator's Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	17	54.8
Female	7	22.6
Both	7	22.6

Note. Multiple responses were allowed for each sexually harassing behavior experienced, but the researcher collapsed the "sex of the perpetrator(s)" into one of the above categories for each respondent.

Table 14. Percentage and Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced as an Intern, Student, and Professional By Perceived Quality of a Role

	Amount of Behaviors								
	Intern*			Student			Professional**		
Quality of Role	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None
Very Positive	12(7)	28(16)	60(34)	10(6)	24(14)	66(39)	4(6)	40(17)	47(20)
Somewhat Positive	27(6)	41(9)	32(7)	17(3)	11(2)	72(13)	37(14)	34(13)	29(11)
Neutral	27(3)	18(2)	55(6)	0	44(4)	56(5)	43(3)	43(3)	14(1)
Somewhat Negative	0	67(2)	33(1)	0	40(2)	60(3)	60(3)	40(2)	0
Very Negative	100(1)	0	0	0	0	100(3)	0	100(1)	0

Note. Frequencies are presented in parentheses. Percentages were calculated from the "quality" variable. *r = -.21, $p < .05$; **r = -.33, $p < .001$. n = 94; two missing from each role.

Table 15. Percentage and Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced by a Woman as an Intern, Student, and Professional By Perceived Quality of a Role

	Amount of Behaviors								
	Intern**			Student			Professional*		
Quality of Role	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None
Very Positive	14(4)	24(7)	62(18)	12(4)	29(10)	59(20)	16(3)	58(11)	26(5)
Somewhat Positive	27(4)	46(7)	27(4)	0	22(2)	78(7)	39(9)	39(9)	22(5)
Neutral	50(2)	25(1)	25(1)	0	33(2)	67(4)	40(2)	40(2)	20(1)
Somewhat Negative	0	50(1)	50(1)	0	50(1)	50(1)	100(3)	0	0
Very Negative	100(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	100(1)	0

Note. Frequencies presented in parentheses. Percentages were calculated from the "quality" variable. *r = -.28, $p < .05$; **r = -.34, $p < .01$. n = 52;one missing value from each role.

Table 16. Percentage and Frequency of the Amount of Sexual Harassment Experienced by a Male as an Intern, Student, and Professional by Perceived Quality of a Role

	Amount of Behaviors								
	Intern			Student			Professional*		
Quality of Role	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None	5+	1-4	None
Very Positive	11(3)	32(9)	57(16)	8(2)	16(4)	76(19)	12(3)	25(6)	63(15)
Somewhat Positive	29(2)	29(2)	42(3)	33(3)	0	67(6)	33(5)	27(4)	40(6)
Neutral	14(1)	14(1)	72(5)	0	67(2)	33(1)	50(1)	50(1)	0
Somewhat Negative	0	100(1)	0	0	33(1)	67(2)	0	100(2)	0
Very Negative	0	0	0	0	0	100(3)	0	0	0

Note. Frequencies are presented in parentheses. Percentages were calculated from the "quality" variable. *r = -.34, $p < .05$. n =44; one missing value from each role.